

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 remain pending in the application. Claims 1-3 have been amended herein. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Applicants have adopted the claim amendments suggested by the Examiner on page 4 of the Office Action. Specifically, applicants have amended claims 1-3 to establish that the cylinder holding member and the guide member are formed as a single unitary body, and that the guide member extends from the tape cassette opening to the tape pull-out completion position.¹

Beginning on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledged applicants arguments that the positioning members 2 in *Matsuoka et al.* do not make up guide members between the opening in the tape cassette and the tape pull-out completion position, as recited in the claims. However, the Examiner indicated that the claim language does not positively establish that the guide member integral with the cylinder holding member has to extend along the entire path of movement of the tape pull-out member between the opening in the tape cassette to the tape pull-out complete position. The Examiner indicated that the fact that the guide member 2 of *Matsuoka et al.* extends along only part of the path is sufficient for *Matsuoka et al.* to be properly applied against the pending claims.

Therefore, the Examiner suggested that applicants modify the language of claims 1 and 2 (and 3) to establish that the cylinder holding member and the guide member are formed as a single unitary body and that the guide member extends from the tape cassette opening to the tape pull-out completion position.

¹ Claim 1 has been further amended to provide antecedent basis for the "tape cassette opening" and the "tape pull-out completion position".

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's suggestion and have amended the claims accordingly. Support for such amendments is found, for example, in Figs. 2-3 and at page 27, lines 15-23.

Entry of the amendments and favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

II. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants again acknowledge with appreciation the noted allowability of claim 8. Claim 8 will be in condition for allowance upon being amended to independent form.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-7 UNDER 35 USC §102(b)/103(a)

Claims 1-7 remain rejected under 35 USC §102(b)/103(a) based on *Matsuoka et al.* For the reasons discussed above and in applicants' previous response, applicants respectfully submit that *Matsuoka et al.* does not teach or suggest the invention as recited in amended claims 1-3, or the claims dependent therefrom.

IV. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims 1-8 are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Application No.: 10/820,281

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Mark D. Saralino/

Mark D. Saralino

Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: October 10, 2007

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113